



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,181	11/03/2000	Theron Tock	DANAP001	5562

44987 7590 08/30/2006

HARRITY SNYDER, LLP
11350 Random Hills Road
SUITE 600
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER

LAZARO, DAVID R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/706,181

Applicant(s)

TOCK ET AL.

Examiner

David Lazaro

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/03/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed 07/10/2006.
2. Claims 28 and 34 were amended.
3. Claims 1-27 are canceled.
4. Claims 28-40 are pending in this office action.

Response to Amendment

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 28-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 28-30 and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Intermediaries: new places for producing and manipulating web content" by Barrett et al. (Barrett) in view of U.S. Patent 6,681,327 by Jardin (Jardin) and "How To Personalize the Web" (hereinafter BMK).

9. With respect to Claim 28, Barrett teaches an information retrieval system that retrieves information requested by a client machine from a remote server via a network, the client machine operating a network browser (Page 510, 1st paragraph "Intermediaries..."), the system comprising:

an intermediate server coupled to a network (Page 514-515, Section 4.1 "Configurations"), said intermediate server configured to connect with the network browser of the client machine, and in response to requests received from the client machine the connection, form a connection with the remote server to obtain data on behalf of the client machine (Page 511, Section 2 and Fig. 2, and Pages 509-510, first 3 paragraphs of Section 1); and

at least one application plug-in installed on the intermediate server, the application plug-in to alter the data obtained on behalf of the client machine (Pages 512-513, Section 3.2);

wherein the intermediate server returns the altered data to the client machine via the connection as a hyper-text markup language (HTML) document for display by the network browser of the client machine (Pages 512-513, Section 3.2, particularly step (4) and note Table 1 'Document Editor'), the intermediate server inserting at least one toolbar into the HTML document before returning the HTML document to the client (Page 3, Table 1, Document Editor - Examples).

Barrett further teaches the intermediary can be used with HTTP-S, which is HTTP secured through secure socket layer protocol (Page 514, section 4, first paragraph).

While Barrett states the intermediate server is capable of serving as an intermediary for HTTP-S, Barrett does not explicitly disclose the intermediate server is specifically configured to securely connect with the network browser of the client machine via a secure socket layer (SSL) connection. Jardin teaches an intermediate server that is specifically configured to securely connect with the network browser of the client machine via a secure socket layer (SSL) connection (Col. 4 lines 35-58 and see Fig. 2. and Col. 6 lines 4-8). This allows the intermediate server to support and manage client transactions associated with secure connections (Col. 3 lines 4-23).

While Barrett teaches the insertion of a toolbar into the HTML document, Barrett does not explicitly disclose the toolbar providing controls to functionality provided by the intermediate server. BMK teaches information related to the intermediary technology of Barrett (Page 75, abstract). BMK teaches a toolbar added by the intermediary technology can provide controls to functionality provided by the intermediary server (Page 81, Fig. 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by Barrett and modify it as indicated by Jardin and BMK such that the system further comprises an intermediate server coupled to a network, said intermediate server configured to securely connect with the network browser of the client machine via a secure socket layer (SSL) connection, and in response to requests received from the client machine over the SSL connection, form a connection with the remote server to obtain data on behalf of the client machine; and wherein the intermediate server returns the altered data to the client machine via the

SSL connection as a hyper-text markup language (HTML) document for display by the network browser of the client machine, the intermediate server inserting at least one toolbar into the HTML document before returning the HTML document to the client, the toolbar providing controls to functionality provided by the intermediate server. One would be motivated to incorporate the teachings of Jardin, as there is need for the support and management of client transactions associated with secure connections (In Jardin: Col. 2 lines 48-53 and Col. 9 lines 12-23). In addition to the fact that BMK discusses specific extensions of the intermediary technology of Barrett, one would be motivated to incorporate the teachings of BMK as it is desirable to provide solutions to common problems users experience on the web through new, unobtrusive functionality (In BMK: Page 79).

10. With respect to Claim 29, Barrett further teaches wherein the at least one application plug-in is a third party application plug-in (Pages 512-513, Section 3-3.2).

11. With respect to Claim 30, Barrett further teaches wherein the at least one application plug-in includes a plurality of application plug-ins operable to alter the data obtained on behalf of the client machine in series (Page 512-513, Section 3.2).

12. With respect to Claim 34, Barrett teaches an intermediary server device comprising:

a web server that receives requests for resources from a client machine via a network (Page 511, Section 2 and Fig. 2, and Pages 509-510, first 3 paragraphs of Section 1);

a handler operatively coupled to the web server, the handler receiving the requests for resources, modifying the requests when the requests are intended for remote servers, and forwarding the modified requests for resources to the remote servers (Page 512-513, Section 3.2, and Page 513 Table 1 "Request Editor" and "Generator"); and

a parser operatively coupled to the handler, the parser receiving the resources supplied by the remote servers in response to the modified requests and altering the resources (Page 512-513, Section 3.2, and Page 513 Table 1, 'Document Editor'), to include at least one toolbar (Page 3, Table 1, Document Editor - Examples);

wherein the web server returns the altered resources to the client machine as hyper-text markup language (HTML) documents for display by a browser on the client machine (Pages 512-513, Section 3.2, particularly step (4) and note Table 1 'Document Editor').

Barrett further teaches the intermediary can be used with HTTP-S, which is HTTP secured through secure socket layer protocol (Page 514, section 4, first paragraph).

While Barrett states the intermediate server is capable of serving as an intermediary for HTTP-S, Barrett does not explicitly disclose the requests being secure requests that are received via secure socket layer (SSL) connections. Jardin teaches an intermediate server that is specifically configured to securely connect with the network browser of the client machine via a secure socket layer (SSL) connection such that secure requests can be received over the connection (Col. 4 lines 35-58 and see

Fig. 2. and Col. 6 lines 4-8). This allows the intermediate server to support and manage client transactions associated with secure connections (Col. 3 lines 4-23).

While Barrett teaches the insertion of a toolbar into the HTML document, Barrett does not explicitly disclose the toolbar providing controls to functionality provided by the intermediate server. BMK teaches information related to the intermediary technology of Barrett (Page 75, abstract). BMK teaches a toolbar added by the intermediary technology can provide controls to functionality provided by the intermediary server (Page 81, Fig. 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the device disclosed by Barrett and modify it as indicated by Jardin and BMK such that the device further comprises a web server that receives requests for resources from a client machine via a network, the requests being secure requests that are received via secure socket layer (SSL) connections; wherein the web server returns the altered resources to the client machine via the SSL connections as hyper-text markup language (HTML) documents for display by a browser on the client machine; and a parser operatively coupled to the handler, the parser receiving the resources supplied by the remote servers in response to the modified requests and altering the resources to include at least one toolbar that provide controls to functionality provided by the web server. One would be motivated to have this, as there is need for the support and management of client transactions associated with secure connections (In Jardin: Col. 2 lines 48-53 and Col. 9 lines 12-23). In addition to the fact that BMK discusses specific extensions of the intermediary technology of Barrett, one would be

motivated to incorporate the teachings of BMK as it is desirable to provide solutions to common problems users experience on the web through new, unobtrusive functionality (In BMK: Page 79).

13. With respect to Claim 35, Barrett further teaches wherein the server device further includes: an application plug-in framework through which at least one application plug-in is registered (Pages 512-513 section 3 - 3.2), the at least one application plug-in being used to alter the resource by the parser (Page 513 - Table 1 'Document Editor').

14. With respect to Claim 36, Barrett further teaches wherein the at least one application plug-in includes a third-party application plug-in (Pages 512-513, Section 3-3.2).

15. With respect to Claim 37, Barrett further teaches wherein at least one application plug-in includes a plurality of application plug-ins operable to alter the resources by the parser in a serial manner (Pages 512-513, Section 3-3.2 and note Page 515 section 4.2).

16. Claims 31, 32, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett in view of Jardin and BMK as applied to claim 28 and 34 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,598,167 by Devine et al. (Devine).

17. With respect to Claims 31 and 38, Barrett in view of Jardin and BMK further teaches the intermediary server receives authentication information from the client machine (In Barrett: Page 515, first paragraph - HTTP proxy authentication).

Barrett in view of Jardin does not explicitly disclose the intermediary server providing the client machine with a login page for the authentication information. Devine teaches providing a client with a login page for the purpose of receiving user identification and authentication information through the login page (Col. 14 lines 40-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system (and corresponding device) disclosed by Barrett in view of Jardin and BMK and modify it as indicated by Devine such that the system (and corresponding device) further comprises wherein the intermediary server provides the client machine with a login page through which the intermediary server receives authentication information from the client machine. One would be motivated to have this, as it is desirable to have an authentication mechanism for separating users in order to, for example, maintain individual histories or provide custom configurations (In Barrett: Page 515, first paragraph). Furthermore, there is need for authentication through a login procedure in order to insure a user has valid access to they system and/or associated services (In Devine: Col. 31 lines 18-43).

18. With respect to Claims 32 and 39, Barrett in view of Jardin and BMK does not explicitly disclose, wherein, after a successful login attempt, the intermediary server provides the client machine with a session identifier.

Devine teaches providing a client with a login page for the purpose of receiving user identification and authentication information through the login page (Col. 14 lines

40-52). After a successful login attempt, the client is provided with a session identifier (Col. 8 lines 43-60 and Col. 20 line 49 - Col. 21 line 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system (and corresponding device) disclosed by Barrett in view of Jardin and BMK and modify it as indicated by Devine such that after a successful login attempt, the intermediary server provides the client machine with a session identifier. One would be motivated to have this, as there is need for associating stateless requests, such as HTTP requests, with a logical session (In Devine: Col. 20 line 49 - Col. 21 line 25). It is further desirable to provide additional security through the use of a session identifier (In Devine: Col. 20 line 49 - Col. 21 line 25).

19. Claims 33 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett in view of Jardin, BMK and Devine as applied to claims 31 and 38 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,752,022 by Chiu et al. (Chiu).

20. With respect to Claims 33 and 40, Barrett in view of Jardin, BMK and Devine further teaches after a successful login attempt, the intermediary server provides the client machine with an initial webpage that includes hyperlinks (In Devine: Col. 16 lines 17-46, and in Barrett: Page 512-515, sections 3 - 3.2 and section 4 - 4.1). Barrett further teaches retrieved documents can be modified according to plug-in configurations (In Barrett: Page 512-513, section 3.2 and Table 1).

Barrett in view of Jardin and Devine does not explicitly disclose the initial webpage includes hyperlinks that are initially directed to the intermediary server but that

ultimately reference the remote server. Chiu teaches one can modify received resources such that certain links contained therein can be modified to be initially directed to the intermediary server system but ultimately reference the remote server (Col. 3 lines 11-25 of Chiu). This allows a system to modify a resource for additional linking information or functions other than those originally provided (Col. 2 lines 35-60 of Chiu).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system (and corresponding device) disclosed by Barrett in view of Jardin, BMK and Devine and modify it as indicated by Chiu such that the system (and corresponding device) further comprises after a successful login attempt, the intermediary server provides the client machine with an initial webpage that includes hyperlinks that are initially directed to the intermediary server but that ultimately reference the remote server. One would be motivated to have this, as there is need for customizing and extending information retrieval to provide users a more flexible and personalized experience (In Barrett, Page 510, 2nd paragraph -"Intermediaries represent...", and Page 511, 1st and Last paragraphs on page).

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

22. U.S. Patent 6,490,602 by Kraemer "Method and apparatus for providing enhanced functionality to product webpages" December 3, 2002. Discloses the use of a

toolbar to control the functionality of a server providing enhanced functionality to product webpages.


23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 571-272-3986. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


David Lazaro
August 25, 2006


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER